BEDES Working Group Meeting 2-25-15 (Technical Topics) – Discussion Summary

Sample Mapping

- Question regarding whether BEDES should use terms defining exact values or ranges –imported data for the same building from different datasets could fail to match because of this issue (for example, one dataset listing a value as a percentage and another as a range.
- Important to keep in mind that we don't want to change the data in a dataset that is being translated, as could happen converting a range to an exact value or vice-versa.
- Possible to flag fields in the metadata as a range and specify a minimum and maximum.
- When receiving data, better to keep to specific data for now; will have to come up with a clever way to accommodate ranges that will still be useful.

Initial and composite terms

- Currently BEDES does not define an order for composite terms…is this OK?
- It is cumbersome to map using composite terms, but at the same time we'd like to keep flexibility.
- How many cases are there going to be when we are exchanging data and where order matters? Are there instances where the order would in fact mean something different? Not very many, but could cause issues especially for developers.
- If BEDES is being used primarily for machine to machine translation, and mostly used by developers, this is less of an issue. This is more of a human issue of just trying to understand it. But that is not our primary use case here, so this is less of an issue.

Redundant terms

- Resource use and energy use are both terms in BEDES 1.0, and is this redundancy important to keep for ease of use or should we remove it? Should we create a single resource use term that uses a qualifier to track energy and other resources? Or should we have separate terms?
- Arguing for just resource use…if someone's coming in with a schema that's just energy use, it might surprise them if they need to use resource with a qualifier… we want to leave recognizable terms like energy use rather than more general terms like resource use that require a qualifier.
- Maybe utility instead of energy? Includes water, sewer and other categories that require a qualifier. It all comes down to the same thing, consumption or production of an item, you just need to know the quantity.
- If people are using the website to do the mapping, maybe there's a way they can find resource qualifiers easily.
- For very commonly used terms like energy use we should keep them in the Dictionary.
- What if we add something in the Resource Use, like Resource Type, under Electricity Gas, Oil, etc. and there is no ambiguity anywhere. Nest or hierarchically qualify terms.

Composite term ambiguity

- Do we care enough about potential redundancy and ambiguity to include commonly used terms like "peak demand" or do we want to create composite terms.
- For example, for on-peak we have a single atomic term, "peak demand". Should we remove this atomic term "peak demand" and only use the composite term version of it? If both are possible than there are two ways to define peak demand, map to atomic term or map to composite term.
- The risk of having the ambiguity in BEDES with both the atomic and composite terms, if you're trying to bind two things together one with the atomic term and one with the composite terms than its more work for you to receive that data and map it to your software.
- Hassle for developers if files have a term like "peak demand" that can be defined in two different ways.
- If we're breaking it out as a composite term we should do that consistently throughout the standard…we shouldn't leave terms in just to make things easier for non-technical people.

New Areas for BEDES

- Where should BEDES expand its scope? What are your priorities and what are some sources for those areas to expand into?
- Energy efficiency financing: Take steps toward common data collection practices for energy efficiency lending, to benefit administrators, policymakers, lenders and investors.
- Tied to a larger narrative focused on bringing in investors, who need more standardized data and better data availability.
- Finance has slightly different stakeholders, but overlapping in about half the terms.
- Is there a fair amount of standardization of the terminology in the finance area? Only 8 fields are named and defined similarly out of a total of 90…likely a pretty small mis-alignment, but the initial indications is that they are not aligned.
- Can the lab team put together a how-to to put together new datasets like these to add to BEDES? How do we create a replicable process so stakeholders can add modules to BEDES.
- Suggestions for particular areas where people would like BEDES to expand:
  - Loan data
  - Standardize components of utility bills. Maybe look at utility bill processors? They have data sets that might be useful for BEDES.
  - Code compliance, and all the various areas that covers.
  - Networking and connectivity.